

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
----------------	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--

Conn.	<p>No. There is no state plan in place yet.</p> <p>SBC/SNET is subject to the SBC/AIT FCC merger measures and penalties.</p> <p>Also, WCOM has negotiated /arbitrated a performance assurance plan with SNET.</p>	<p>State proceeding is Docket No. 99-07-27 provides for an industry working group to negotiate and recommend to the DPUC specific performance standard measures and submeasures, penalties, business rules and terms and conditions of implementing performance measures for the wholesale provision of telecom services by the incumbent.</p>	<p>Metrics will be proposed by an industry-working group and ultimately approved by the DPUC.</p>	<p>The merger measures SNET is required to report results against use the Texas business rules, standards, etc.</p>	TBD	TBD	TBD	<p>There are no state specific metrics, standards or remedies. Remedies under the SBC/AIT merger conditions are not paid to affected CLECs.</p>
-------	---	--	---	---	-----	-----	-----	---

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
Illinois	Yes. PMs in place per state condition for approval of SBC-AIT merger. Recently passed state law requires wholesale metrics, establishes benchmarks for various wholesale products: loops, UNE-P, etc. State proceeding resulting from law is in progress.	Merger condition # 30 of SBC/AIT Merger Order: Docket No. 01-0120  State-law derived proceeding: Docket No. 01-0539	Proceedings resulted from merger conditions and state legislation.	About 100 regional collaborative-developed PMs, with less than 15 state specific PMs. Most regional PMs have the same benchmarks; a few have a different standard for one or more states. Less than 5 regional PMs have differing state standards. Some regional PMs are ranked differently for remedies, e.g., Tier 1/Tier 2. State specific plan derived from state law pending.	Six-month reviews of regional PMs held with AIT, CLECs and state staffs. Little work has been done so far on remedies in reviews. Meetings move from state-to-state, with disputed issues and consensus agreements brought back to each state for decision and approval.	No. Although Texas plan is available for contract inclusion on interim basis until state finishes final remedy plan litigation.	Yes. Currently problems with metric replication are delaying the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.	Metrics and standards limited to those included in SBC/AIT merger conditions. Remedy plan is weak. Problems with metric replication identified.
Indiana	Yes, reports on the Texas metrics.  A state specific proceeding has begun, but talks ended prior to completion of work. Next steps remain pending.	Cause No. 41657	Generic proceeding pending.	About 100 regional collaborative-developed PMs, of which less than 15 are state specific. Regional PMs generally have the same benchmarks; a few have a different standard for one or more states. Less than 5 regional PMs have differing state standard. Some regional PMs are ranked differently for remedies, e.g., Tier 1/Tier 2.	Six-month regional reviews of PMs held with AIT, CLECs and state staffs. Little work has been done on remedies so far in reviews. Meetings move from state-to-state, with disputed issues and consensus issues brought back to each state for decision and approval.	No. Some remedies paid only under individual ATI-CLEC Interconnection Agreements.	TBD	State specific metrics and standards have not been ordered, instead relying on Texas metrics.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
<b>Kansas</b>	Yes.	Docket No. 97- SWBT-411-GIT	271 proceeding	Modeled after Texas 271 plan measures and standards.	Yes, reviews conducted every 6 months. TX PUC will conduct the review and KS is free to participate.	Yes. Based on TX remedy plan. While % of net revenue is the same as TX, dollar amounts are specific to KS.	No	Remedy plan weak since based on flawed TX K table. OSS not subject to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.
<b>Michigan</b>	Yes. PMs have been ordered. They were largely agreed to by the parties.	Docket No. Case No. U-11830.	Generic proceeding. AIT region-wide collaborative	About 100 PMs, less than 15 are state specific. The regional PMs generally have the same benchmarks; a few have a different standard for one or more states. Less than 5 regional PMs have differing state standards. Some regional PMs are ranked differently for remedies, e.g., Tier 1/Tier 2. With some state specific variations, in some cases resolved via state dispute resolution process.	Six-month regional reviews of PMs held with AIT, CLECs and state staffs. Little work has been done on remedies so far in reviews. Meetings move from state-to-state, with disputed issues and consensus issues brought back to each state for decision and approval.	Yes.	Yes. The metrics are being used as part of a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party OSS Test.	Some improvement required, although Michigan metrics, standards and remedy plan are superior to those in other AIT states.
<b>Missouri</b>	Yes.	Case No. TO-99-227	271 proceeding	Modeled after Texas 271 plan measures and standards.	Yes, reviews conducted every 6 months. TX PUC will conduct the review, and MO is free to participate.	Yes. Based on TX remedy plan. While % of net revenues is the same as TX, amounts are specific to MO.	Yes. PSC audited the measurement reporting system and results.	Remedy plan weak since based on flawed TX K table. OSS not subject to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
Nevada	Yes. Nevada Bell has had measures and standards since June 1999. The measures and standards were revised effective May 2001 to incorporate parties' negotiated changes to the measures.	Docket No. 97-9022	The measures and standards were agreed to after several months of collaborative workshops. They were "stipulated" to by Nevada Bell, Verizon, Sprint and the participating CLECs, and ordered by the Commission.	The measurements were developed specifically for California and Nevada.	Periodic reviews were agreed to by the parties. It is prescribed by a Commission rulemaking that they occur annually.	Yes, effective as of August 2001, per a PUC decision in Docket No. 01-1048.	Yes, the measures were audited by PWC. Nevada Bell did not have its own 3 <sup>rd</sup> party OSS Test. It has requested that the PUC rely on the test that was conducted for Pacific Bell.	Ok, although the real test of the measures and standards will occur once commercial volumes exist. No Tier II incentive provision. It is possible that the parties have overlooked a process that turns out to be critical to the OSS process, or that the ILEC's interpretation of the business rules allows it to under-report performance failure.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
Ohio	Yes. TX metrics were ordered as a condition of the SBC-AIT merger. Metrics have been modified in the regional 6-month collaboratives	Case no. 98-1082-tp-amt.  In 2000, Ameritech filed a motion to establish a procedural schedule for its anticipated 271 filing. In June 2000, the PUC established Case No. 00-942-tp-coi to address OSS and PM issues, 3 <sup>rd</sup> party testing and its 271 application.	Initially addressed by stipulation in SBC/AIT merger docket. The stipulation established industry collaboratives to evaluate the feasibility and applicability of implementing the Texas measures. Collaborative participants were given opportunity to propose changes to the metrics and to bring disputed issues to the commission for resolution. Some measures were added and modifications were made to the existing TX measures via a series of joint pleadings filed in October 2000. The OSS collaborative proceeded on the same track. In December 2000, the PUC acknowledged the filing of the agreed-to measures and OSS issues, approved the master test plan for the OSS test conducted by KPMG. Briefs filed in February 2001 regarding disputed measurement and OSS issues.	The measures are basically regional, although there may be state-specific differences because of the collaboratives established in each Ameritech state. The measures are based on the Texas plan and include 105 of the TX PMs.	Six-month regional reviews of PMs held with AIT, CLECs and state staffs. Little work has been done on remedies so far in reviews. Meetings move from state-to-state, with disputed issues and consensus issues brought back to each state for decision and approval. Amended measures were filed in June 2001 and October 2001.	No. It is a disputed issue that has been deferred for later consideration.  Penalties will be tied to the measures based on the Texas remedies plan. These are pending commission resolution.	The 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test is underway and the measures will be tested.  The stipulation established a collaborative to address OSS issues, and as part of the order approving the stipulation, the commission ordered a 3 <sup>rd</sup> party OSS test.	No remedies yet. Texas remedy plan is not sufficient and the Commission has indefinitely deferred the development of an appropriate remedy plan.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
Oklahoma	Yes.	Cause No. PUD 97-0000560	271 proceeding	Modeled after Texas 271 plan measures and standards.	Yes, reviews conducted every 6 months. TX PUC will conduct the review, and OK is free to participate.	Yes. Based on TX remedy plan. While % of net revenues is the same as TX, dollar amounts are specific to OK.	No	Remedy plan weak since based on flawed TX K table. OSS not subject to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.
Texas	Yes	16251, Order No. 55	271 proceeding	Anchor state, other SWBT states, as well as Ameritech states mirror the Texas plan measures.	Periodic reviews are held every 6 months.	Yes.	A review of the measures was performed by Cap Gemini as part of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party OSS test. The measures were also used to evaluate the test output.	Remedy plan is weak because plan includes "K table" mitigation
Wisconsin	Yes. State proceeding on metrics concluded in 2000.	Docket No. 6720-TI-160 (the OSS docket)	State proceeding	There are about 100 PMs, less than 15 of which are state specific. The regional PMs generally have the same benchmarks; a few have a different standard for one or more states. Less than 5 regional PMs have differing state standards. Some regional PMs are ranked differently for remedies, e.g., Tier 1/Tier 2.	Six-month regional reviews of PMs held with AIT, CLECs and state staffs. Little work has been done on remedies so far in reviews. Meetings move from state-to-state, with disputed issues and consensus issues brought back to each state for decision and approval.	PSC issued a Remedy Plan Order Sept. 25, 2001. AIT filed motion for and obtained Stay of portions of the Order requiring AIT to make payments under remedy plan. Court schedule pending for briefing and ruling. Decision not expected before May 2002.	TBD	AIT is still not required to pay remedies yet.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
----------------	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--

**Verizon:** Of the 14 states described below, only 9 states have metrics and standards in place and of those only 6 states have remedy plans in effect as of comment date of 1/22/02.

<b>California</b>	Yes. VZ has had measures and standards since August 1999. Measures were revised effective May 2001 to incorporate parties' negotiated changes to the metrics	Proceeding number: R.97-10-016/1.97-10-017, decision D.99-08-020, and D.01-05-087.	The measurements resulted from collaborative negotiations between Pacific, Verizon and the CLECs as part of the PUC's investigation into the OSS performance of Pacific and Verizon. The Commission has adopted a Change Mgmt Process (completed in Feb. 1999), and performance measures. The implementation of a performance incentive plan is pending.	The metrics were developed specifically for California and Nevada	The CPUC provides for periodic reviews of the measures. Review is initiated by the CPUC via a pre-hearing conference. Parties propose changes, negotiate and agree to settle, whenever possible. Parties submit their agreements and open issues to the CPUC for it to approve and where there are issues, to decide.	Almost. Final decision adopting payment amounts for a performance incentive plan will be adopted in February 2002. This, plus the decision adopting the incentives model (D. 01-01-037) in January 2001 will comprise California's incentive plan.	Yes, the measures were audited by Deloitte & Touche.	Generally ok although real test of the measures and standards will occur once commercial volumes exist. No incentive payments have been made yet. It is possible that the parties have overlooked a process that turns out to be critical to the OSS process, or that the ILEC's interpretation of business rules allows it to under-report performance failure
-------------------	--	--	--	---	---	--	--	---

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
----------------	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--

Conn.	Verizon currently required to comply with performance metrics embodied in the PAP, which largely mirrors the New York performance assurance plan.	State proceeding is Docket No. 99-07-27 (DPUC Promulgation of Performance-based Reporting Requirements Regulations for Connecticut Telephone Companies (ILEC)) provides for an industry working group to negotiate and recommend to the DPUC specific performance standard measures and submeasures, penalties, business rules and terms and conditions relating to the implementation of performance standard measures for the wholesale provision of telecom services by the incumbent.	Metrics will be proposed by an industry-working group and ultimately approved by the DPUC. The regulations and reporting requirements from DPUC Docket No. 99-07-27 are not yet final or effective.	Largely regional.	Verizon files changes to its PAP with DPUC.	The regulations, and ultimately metrics, anticipated from the DPUC Docket No. 99-07-27 are separate and distinct from the PAP adopted as a result of the state 271 proceeding.	No.	Has room for improvement. The regulations and reporting requirements from DPUC Docket No. 99-07-27 are not yet final or effective.
Delaware	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No.	N/A	N/A



### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
----------------	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--

<b>Maine</b>	No. PAP and C2C are currently being considered in the state 271 proceeding.	Docket No. 2000-849.	The PAP and C2C metrics are both based on NY. The PUC has stated an intent to add ME specific metrics.	Likely to be both, but largely regional, based on NY.	TBD	TBD.	No.	TBD
<b>Maryland</b>	No. The Commission is now considering metrics and standards in the on-going "Collaborative" process. A decision could come at any time.	No official docket number.	The metrics and standards are modeled after NY, although there are some state specific metrics. Differences are usually related to timing (one state implementing new/changed metrics before another state). Verizon has generally agreed with CLECs and the state commission about the need for metrics and standards. Thus, consensus has generally been achieved.	Regional, based on NY.	Plan is not in place yet so it is not known how periodic reviews will be handled.	There is no process yet for implementation of remedies.	No. There has been no 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test or audit of the metrics.	TBD

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
<b>Mass.</b>	Yes, metrics are in place. On January 14, 2000, the DTE adopted the New York Carrier-to-Carrier Performance Guidelines (as amended on a going-forward basis) as the "set of metrics used by the DTE for purposes of the Master Test Plan and for evaluating Verizon's compliance with the requirements contained in Section 271."	D.T.E. 99-271, January 14, 2000 DTE Letter Order on Final OSS Master Test Plan, Attach. A ( <a href="http://www.state.ma.us/dpu/telecom/99-271/OSS/LtrOrder_Jan14.pdf">http://www.state.ma.us/dpu/telecom/99-271/OSS/LtrOrder_Jan14.pdf</a> ).	Metrics based on NY C2C (as amended), per DTE order.	Regional, based on NY metrics.	Per the DTE's January 14, 2000 Letter Order, the Guidelines adopted "will continue to be modified by all future additions, deletions or modifications made to the C3C Guidelines hereafter by the NYPSC."	Penalties are based on the same standards as the MA PAP, and the NY plan. They are also subject to NY revisions.	Yes. The DTE "direct[ed] KPMG to examine and evaluate Bell Atlantic's performance based on the metrics contained in the C2C Guidelines that are in effect when the preorder, order and provisioning transaction testing begins."	Some of the metrics need improvement.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	No. On June 7, 2001, Verizon petitioned the PUC to approve the NY C2C metrics for NH. The PUC is reviewing and has not made a decision on whether it will accept the NY measures or modify them.	Docket No. 01-006	Will be primarily based on the NY metrics, though they may be tailored to address the specific concerns of competitors in NH.	Regional, based on NY.	If the VZ proposed metrics are adopted in NH, any revisions to the NY metrics will be filed in NH within 20 days.	No. Options are still being reviewed and a PAP has not yet been finalized.	Yes. As part of its OSS review for sameness, PWC did a review of the NH metric reporting for sameness with the New England region.	Some of the metrics need improvement.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLD.COM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
----------------	--	----------------------------	--	---	--	---	--	--

New Jersey	Yes. The Board has ordered metrics.	Docket No. TX98010010	The metrics and standards are modeled after NY, although there are some state specific metrics. Differences are usually related to timing (one state implementing new or changed metrics before another state). Verizon has generally agreed with the CLECs and the state commission about the need for metrics and standards. Thus, with minor exceptions consensus has generally been achieved.	Regional, based on NY.	Plan has not been in place long enough to know how periodic reviews will be handled.	Yes. The Board ordered remedies in October 2001 in the same docket as the metrics docket.  The remedies, which are tied to the metrics, are based on the staff plan, which is not based on NY. plan. It is a per occurrence/ per measure plan.	Yes. The metrics were included in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.	Some of the metrics need improvement. The penalty amounts are very low.
---------------	---	--------------------------	---	---------------------------	--	---	---	--

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
New York	Yes. Metrics have been in place since February 16, 1999.	Adopted in Case 97-C-0139, <i>Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Review Service Quality Standards of Telephone Companies, Order Adopting Inter-Carrier Service Quality Guidelines</i> (issued and effective February 16, 1999).	At the time it instituted Case 97-C-0139 in Feb. 1997, the PSC recognized that no formal service quality standards for carrier- to-carrier services existed, although the issue had been raised by parties in several other PSC proceedings, and directed Staff to work with parties to address the issues concerning C2C standards. Interim Guidelines for C2C Standards and Reports were developed through a collaborative process involving industry reps, Staff and the ALJ overseeing the proceeding. The Commission approved the Interim Guidelines on 3/16/98, for a trial period extending through 12/31/98. Then, on 2/16/99, the Commission issued an order adopting the C2C Guidelines, a revision of the Interim Guidelines document.	Regional in that other states have based their metrics on NY.	The C2C Guidelines are subject to change, as Case 97- C-0139 remains an ongoing proceeding with CWG meeting regularly throughout the year to discuss modifications that should be made to the Guidelines as parties gain experience in the market. Consensus and non-consensus modification proposals are acted on by the Commission on Generally a bi- annual basis.	Yes. Penalties are tied to VZ's PAP, not to the C2C Guidelines.	Yes. KPMG tested the metrics as part of the OSS review for Verizon's 271 application. More specifically, KPMG tested the accuracy of VZ's reporting, not the adequacy of the metrics. Since KPMG's test, there have been many modifications to the C2C Guidelines. Staff has been replicating the metrics.	Some of the metrics need improvement. For example, the trunking measures are inadequate. The measures, including the trunk blocking metric, are currently the subject of review and negotiations within the CWG.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
Penn.	Yes. First order was December 1999. The PUC is now considering a recommended decision of an ALJ in its review of the PAP. A decision could come at any time.	Docket No. P-00991643, and Docket No. M-00011468.	<p>The metrics and standards are modeled after NY, although there are some state specific metrics. Differences are usually related to timing (one state implementing new or changed metrics before another state).</p> <p>Verizon has generally agreed with the CLECs and the state commission about the need for metrics and standards. Thus, with some minor exceptions consensus has generally been achieved.</p>	Regional, based on NY.	There is a presumption that changes in NY are appropriate for PA, but that presumption is rebuttable.	The commission initially ordered a plan, but it was shown to be weak during the 271 case. As a result, the PUC instituted the latest proceeding. The ALJ has recommended that the PUC adopt essentially the NY plan. The remedies are tied to the metrics.	Yes. The metrics were included in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.	Poor.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
<b>Rhode Island</b>	Yes. Per recent Order, C2C metrics have been adopted.	Docket Nos. 3195 & 3256, Report and Order (Dec. 3, 2001. In re: VZ-Rhode Island's Proposed Carrier-to- Carrier Performance Standards and Reports and Performance Assurance Plan for Rhode Island. ( <a href="http://www.ripuc.org/order/pdfs/VRI CTC PAP Ord16809.pdf">http://www.ripuc.org/order/pdfs/VRI CTC PAP Ord16809.pdf</a> )	Based on NY & MA, per PUC order.	Regional in that they are based on NY & MA. PUC also incorporated two PA billing metrics into C2C and PAP, made several changes to how PAP penalties would be calculated, and ordered potential future revisions to C2C to be based on changes in all VZ states, not just NY and MA.	From Dec. 3, 2001 Report & Order: "the Commission requires Verizon to file for Commission consideration of any new metrics adopted in Verizon's service territory, as well as in the former Bell Atlantic territory before its merger with GTE, within thirty (30) days of the compliance filing with that state Commission. In addition, to assist the Commission in determining whether Verizon is meeting the PAP metrics, the Commission will require Verizon to file with its monthly C2C performance reports a chart, similar to one submitted in Docket No. 3363, indicating whether it has met or failed to meet each PAP metric included in C2C."	Penalties are tied to metrics comprising the PAP; also subject to NY & MA revisions, i.e., "Any modifications ordered to the PAPs in NY or MA will be filed for this Commission's review within 10 days of the compliance filing in NY or MA").	Yes. Per May 17, 2001 Order, the PUC "direct[ed] KPMG to submit an amended final Master Test Plan for the Verizon- Rhode Island OSS Test that excludes metrics report validation and data integrity validation." KPMG generally conducted "sameness" testing "to determine whether the processes and procedures" were the same for VZ- RI and VZ-MA.	Some of the metrics need improvement.  Also, the PUC's demand to be informed of metrics changes throughout VZ's territory suggests that RI metrics may evolve.

### STATE METRICS MATRIX PREPARED BY WORLDCOM

ILEC/ State	Has State Ordered Metrics and Standards	Docket/ Order Number	How Metrics and Standards Were Adopted	Whether Metrics and Standards Are Regional or State Specific	Does State Hold Periodic Reviews of the Metrics and Standards	Whether Metrics and Standards Have an Associated Remedy Plan	Whether a 3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Tested or Audited the Metrics	What General Improvements To the Plans Are Needed
<b>Virginia</b>	Yes. The SCC issued an order on 1/4/02 requiring VZ to implement the agreed to and ordered metrics and standards by 1/18/02. First results to be reported in March based on February 2002 data Remedies are the subject of a second docket. Comments in the remedies docket were filed in November, 2001. Date for a decision in the remedies docket is unknown.	Docket No. PUC -010206 and Docket No. 010226.	The metrics and standards are modeled after NY, although there are some state specific metrics. Differences are usually related to timing (one state implementing new or changed metrics before another state).  Verizon has generally agreed with the CLECs and the state commission about the need for metrics and standards. Thus, with some minor exceptions consensus has generally been achieved.	Regional, based on NY.	Verizon is required to file with the Commission the NY consensus and/or non-consensus metric change(s) and proposed implementation schedule, including an explanation of time required to implement, and description of the changes made to adapt to Virginia systems. Filings must be made within 30 calendar days of submission date of the compliance filing in NY.	Not yet. The SCC is considering remedies in Docket 010226.	Yes. The metrics were included in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party test.	TBD. Order was just released.
<b>Vermont</b>	Yes. Per Stipulation setting NY C2C measurements as the measurements for VT (October 2001).	Docket No. 6255	Metrics are based on the NY metrics, though they may be tailored to address the specific concerns of competitors in VT.	Regional, based on NY.	If a change is made to NY it must be filed in VT within 30 days.	Not yet. Penalties are still being discussed in VT Docket No. 6255. No final PAP has been issued.	Yes. As part of its OSS review for sameness, PWC did a review of the VT metric reporting for sameness with the New England region.	Some room for improvement.
<b>Wash. DC</b>	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A
<b>West Virginia</b>	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A

# **APPENDIX B**





**ILEC PERFORMANCE**  
**MEASUREMENTS & STANDARDS**  
**For LOCAL INTERCONNECTION,**  
**RESALE AND UNEs**

Version 2.0

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### PREORDERING/GENERAL OSS METRICS

1.	Percent System Availability.....	4
2.	A. Query Response Timeliness.....	5
	B. Percent Ordering/PreOrdering System Error/Timeouts .....	5

### CHANGE CONTROL METRICS

3.	A. Percent Change Management Notices/Documentation Sent On-Time.....	7
	B. Average Delay Days.....	7
4.	A. Percent Software Error Correction in X Days .....	9
	B. Average Delay Hours/Days.....	9

### ORDERING/PROVISIONING STATUS NOTIFIER AND QUALITY METRICS

5.	CLEC Center Responses in X Days.....	11
6.	Percent Order Accuracy .....	13
7.	Percent Flow Through.....	15
8.	Percent On-Time LSRC/FOC .....	17
9.	Percent On-Time Reject Notices .....	19
10.	Percent Jeopardy Notices.....	21
11.	Percent On Time Completion Notices .....	23
12.	Percent Timely Loss Notifications.....	24

### PROVISIONING METRICS

13.	Average Completion Interval (with dispersion around average).....	25
14.	Percent Orders Completed on Time.....	27
15.	Percent Timely Coordinated Conversions .....	30

16.	A. Average ILEC Caused Provisioning Outage Duration .....	31
	B. Percent ILEC Caused Provisioning Outages.....	31
17.	Percentage Of Orders Held – 5, 15, 30 days.....	33
18.	Troubles Within 30 days of Install/Order Activity .....	35

#### **MAINTENANCE METRICS**

19.	Mean Time to Restore.....	37
20.	Trouble Report Rate.....	39
21.	Percent Repeat Trouble Report Rate.....	41
22.	Percent of Customer Troubles Resolved Within Estimated Time .....	43

#### **NETWORK PERFORMANCE METRICS**

23.	Percent Trunk Blockage.....	45
24.	Percent Timely Collocation Response .....	46
25.	A. Percent Collocation/Augment Appointments Met.....	47
	B. Average Collocation/Augment Interval .....	47
26.	NXX/LRN Loaded by LERG Effective Date .....	49

#### **BILLING METRICS**

27.	Timeliness of Daily Usage Feed.....	50
28.	Timeliness of Carrier Invoice .....	51
29.	A. Billing Error Correction Requests Acknowledged in X Hours.....	52
	B. Billing Errors Corrected in X Days.....	52

**PREORDERING/GENERAL OSS METRICS:**

<b>Metric Number: Name:</b>	
<b>1. Percent System Availability</b>	
<b>Definition:</b>	
This measurement shows the whether OSS interfaces on the ILEC's side of the gateway are operating in a non-degraded capacity.	
<b>Exclusions:</b>	
Scheduled Downtime if Appropriately Noticed Through Change Control Process.	
<b>Business Rules:</b>	
The interface is considered down if any part of the route to the ILEC back end system from the ILEC gateway is down. Degraded operations (errors or timeouts for every sixth transaction) also are included in the calculation. No down time is to be scheduled during CLEC prime hours of operation as well ILEC prime hours, meaning no scheduled down time between 6 a.m. to 12 p.m. (EST, CST, MST, PST) should be scheduled to capture prime times across the country for CLEC order entry centers. The denominator is not to exceed the total hours in the reporting period. If the ILEC desires to multiply the denominator by the number of servers in an automatic load balancing situation, it must weight the outage in the numerator by the number of servers the CLEC has supporting its operations. For example, if one CLEC's interface is supported by five servers and another CLEC's by one server, the latter CLEC would have its outage hour multiplied by five to designate its impact. Partial weights need also be agreed to for degraded service.	
<b>Levels Of Disaggregation:</b>	
Each Individual Interface Type Offered (e.g. Web GUI, EDI, ECTA etc.).	
<b>Calculation:</b>	<b>Report Structure/Geography:</b>
(Number of Scheduled Interface Available Hours –Number of Unscheduled Interface Unavailable Hours / Total Hours of Scheduled Availability) x 100	CLEC Specific CLEC Aggregate ILEC ILEC Affiliate(s) Geographic: State
<b>Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:</b>	
99.5% Availability	
<b>Impact on Carriers' Regulatory Burden:</b>	
Dominant carriers on which CLECs depend must bear the burden of assuring the performance provided to their CLEC customers is (1) at parity with retail service or (2) at a benchmark level that provides the CLEC with a meaningful opportunity to compete. CLECs do not have the leverage to negotiate satisfactory service level agreements and enforcement clauses from their major (if not sole-source) supplier and competitor and meaningful competition requires the ordering of such reporting and remedies. System availability can be monitored automatically and this information should not be a burden for ILECs to provide. Most large ILECs already provide this information in state wholesale performance reporting.	

<b>Metric Number: Name:</b>
<b>2 (a) Query Response Timeliness</b> <b>(b) Percent Ordering/PreOrdering System Error/TimeOuts</b>
<b>Definition:</b>
This measurement shows the percent of queries the ILEC returns to the CLEC within the benchmark interval for those queries submitted through the ILEC's interfaces .
<b>Exclusions:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test Transactions</li> </ul>
<b>Business Rules:</b>
<p>The query transaction is measured from the time the CLEC query reaches the ILEC gateway to the time the query response is returned to the ILEC gateway. Error or reject message returns are measured separately so that their often swift return does not dilute the times for responses actually containing information. A separate measurement of percent of time-outs and non-CLEC-caused system error messages also are measured to determine whether there are problems with the systems not captured by query response time measurement alone. Timeouts are measured to the longest time it would take to return an informational response to a specific type of query. As new interfaces and query types are implemented in production, the ILEC must measure them within six weeks of implementation. If special benchmark is needed for new query type, then reporting will be diagnostic until next periodic review of the measurements.</p> <p>For some ILECs, Loop Make Up Information and Large CSRs can only be obtained through manual query processes. Manual processes will be measured as separate disaggregations with different benchmarks.</p>
<b>Levels Of Disaggregation:</b>
<p>By the Type of Query Below As Provided by Each Interface (e.g. EDI, GUI, CORBA, ECTA and maintenance GUI).</p> <p>Pre-Order Queries:</p> <p>Electronic CSR          Parsed CSR          Manual CSR          Due Date Scheduling          Number Reservation          Address Validation          Service/Product Availability          Electronic Loop Make Up Information          Manual Loop Make Up Information          Manual Dark Fiber Facilities Check          Manual DS1, DS3 and OCn Facilities Check          CFA          PIC</p>

(Any other query type provided by ILEC.) Maintenance:  Open Trouble Close Trouble Status Trouble Mechanized Line Testing (Any other query type provided by ILEC)  All PreOrder/Ordering Error/Reject Messages  Percent Time Outs/System Error Messages	
<b>Calculation:</b>  (Number of PreOrder and Maintenance Query Responses Provided Within Benchmark Standard / Total Number of Queries in Reporting Period.) x 100  Number of PreOrder and Ordering Queries That Time Out / Number of PreOrder and Ordering Queries Submitted in reporting period	<b>Report Structure/Geography:</b>  CLEC Specific CLEC Aggregate ILEC ILEC Affiliate(s) Geographic: State
<b>Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:</b> Parsed CSR: 95% Parity + 10 seconds Manual CSR 95% in 2 days. Manual Loop Qualification 95% in 24 hours Manual Dark Fiber Facilities Check in 48 hours DS1, DS3, OCn Facilities Check in 24 hours  All Other Queries: 95% in Parity + 2 seconds (Benchmarks are also appropriate but times vary among ILEC regions.)	
<b>Impact on Carriers' Regulatory Burden:</b> Dominant carriers on which CLECs depend must bear the burden of assuring the performance provided to their CLEC customers is (1) at parity with retail service or (2) at a benchmark level that provides the CLEC with a meaningful opportunity to compete. CLECs do not have the leverage to negotiate satisfactory service level agreements and enforcement clauses from their major (if not sole-source) supplier and competitor and meaningful competition requires the ordering of such reporting and remedies. This information can be captured by most ILECs for the wholesale interfaces they deploy. Performance of legacy retail OSS systems that cannot provide this information automatically can be assessed through electronic emulation and sampling. Benchmarks may also be used, but retail reporting still needs to be monitored to adjust the benchmark accordingly.	

# **CHANGE CONTROL METRICS:**

<b>Metric Number: Name:</b>	
<b>3 (a) Percent Change Management Notices/Documentation Sent On-Time (b) Average Delay Days</b>	
<b>Definition:</b>	
This measurement shows the percentage of time in which the CLEC received notices of business rule and software changes and any associated documentation within intervals established in the Change Control Process rules developed collaboratively by ILEC and CLEC trading partners.	
<b>Exclusions:</b>	
None	
<b>Business Rules:</b>	
Measurement of the interval for determining timely sent notices and documentation start the date the notice/documentation is sent and end on the effective/production date for the change. When no notice of or documentation for the change is received at all, the notice/documentation is counted as late. The timeliness of notice/documentation will be measured in the month in which the change is implemented, meaning that the times used in the numerator may reach back to prior reporting periods. Average Delay Days are counted from when the notice/documentation should have been sent to the date the notice/documentation actually was sent.	
<b>Levels Of Disaggregation:</b>	
Notices Documentation	
<b>Calculation:</b>	<b>Report Structure/Geography:</b>
Percent Timely:  $\frac{\text{(Number of Timely Sent Notices/Documentation / Total Number of Notices/Documentation Changes Due in Reporting Period)}}{100}$ Average Delay Days:  $\frac{\text{Date and Time Notice/Documentation Sent} - \text{Date and Time Notice/Documentation Should Have Been Sent}}{\text{Total Number of Notices/Documentation Due in the Reporting Period}}$	CLEC Specific CLEC Aggregate ILEC Affiliate(s) Geographic: State
<b>Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:</b>	
98% within interval for Notices, Draft and Final Documentation in Change Control Process Guidelines. Average Delay Days = < 5 days.	
<b>Impact on Carriers' Regulatory Burden:</b>	

Dominant carriers on which CLECs depend must bear the burden of assuring the performance provided to their CLEC customers is (1) at parity with retail service or (2) at a benchmark level that provides the CLEC with a meaningful opportunity to compete. CLECs do not have the leverage to negotiate satisfactory service level agreements and enforcement clauses from their major (if not sole-source) supplier and competitor and meaningful competition requires the ordering of such reporting and remedies. This metric is crucial to CLECs in keeping OSS interfaces irreversibly open, and any burden on ILEC would not outweigh this benefit. The number of changes monthly should not be time intensive to keep either manually or in a database.



<b>Metric Number: Name:</b>	
<b>4 (a) Percent Software Error Correction in X Days</b> <b>(b) Average Delay Hours/Days</b>	
<b>Definition:</b>	
This measurement calculates the percentage of software errors corrected within the benchmark intervals for problems with and without work arounds.	
<b>Exclusions:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ILECs may exclude problems that ILEC and CLEC agree are the CLEC's fault. (If fault is disputed, ILEC must list the number of such disputed problems in the reporting period.)</li> <li>• Problems resulting during software certification processes prior to production.</li> </ul>	
<b>Business Rules:</b>	
Software problems are tracked from when the CLEC reports the problem to the help desk to when the CLEC concurs that the problem has been resolved upon receiving a resolution call from the ILEC help desk. Software problems are those that cause failed transactions. A transaction is considered failed if it results in incorrect or improperly formatted data. The ability to fax preorder/order requests does not mean the problem has a work around.	
<b>Levels Of Disaggregation:</b>	
Problems <u>Without</u> Work-Arounds Problems <u>With</u> Work-Arounds.	
<b>Calculation:</b>	<b>Report Structure/Geography:</b>
Percent Timely:  (Number of Software Errors Cleared within Benchmark / Total Number of Software Errors Due to be Resolved in the Reporting Period) x 100  Average Delay Days:  Date and Time of Error Resolution Occurred – Date and Time Timely Error Resolution Due / Total Number of Errors Resolutions in Reporting Period	CLEC Specific CLEC Aggregate ILEC Affiliate(s) Geographic: State
<b>Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:</b>	
Problems without Work Arounds: 98% Cleared in 24 hours Problems with Work Arounds: 98% in 72 hours	
<b>Impact on Carriers' Regulatory Burden:</b>	
Dominant carriers on which CLECs depend must bear the burden of assuring the performance provided to their CLEC customers is (1) at parity with retail service or (2) at a benchmark level that provides the CLEC with a meaningful opportunity to compete. CLECs do not have the leverage to negotiate satisfactory service level agreements and	